



CALIFORNIA  
DEPARTMENT OF  
EDUCATION

1430 N STREET  
SACRAMENTO, CA  
95814-5901

**JACK O'CONNELL**

State Superintendent of  
Public Instruction

PHONE: (916) 319-0800

## SUMMARY MEETING NOTES

### **CALIFORNIA P-16 COUNCIL** **Barry Munitz, Chair**

**CTA State Headquarters**  
**1705 Murchison Drive**  
**Burlingame, CA 94010**

**Friday, December 9, 2005**

### **Welcoming Remarks from Barry Munitz**

Dr. Barry Munitz welcomed the P-16 Council members and commended them for their commitment to the Council. Dr. Munitz also expressed his appreciation to the California Teachers Association for hosting the meeting.

Dr. Munitz asked the Council members and the California Department of Education (CDE) staff to introduce themselves to the group.

### **Housekeeping Issues**

- **September 20, 2005, Summary Meeting Notes** – The summary notes from the September 20, 2005, meeting were approved by the Council.
- **CDE Announcements** – Sue Stickel, Deputy Superintendent of Curriculum and Instruction for the CDE, reminded the group to save the date, February 7, 2006, for the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Jack O'Connell's third annual State of Education Address.
- **Subcommittee's Draft Recommendations** – Sue praised the subcommittee members for all the hard work they put into the draft recommendations that they were presenting today. Sue discussed the protocol and time allocation for the subcommittee presentations. A suggested format for submitting the subcommittee's recommendations was included in the council member packets. Sue asked the subcommittees to submit their recommendations by the end of January 2006.

### **Groupwork**

The Council members convened into their subcommittees. Each subcommittee was provided time to work on their recommendations and presentation.

## **Presentations**

Diane Siri, Executive Director of the Alliance for Regional Collaboration to Heighten Educational Success (ARCHES), provided information on the ARCHES program which emphasizes a regional collaborative approach to improve student achievement. To support the formation of new and emerging collaboratives, ARCHES recently offered planning grants to qualified collaboratives. Ms. Siri provided an update on the grants.

## **Subcommittee's Draft Recommendations**

Each subcommittee presented their draft recommendations to the P-16 Council.

### **Subcommittee # 1 (Relevance)**

#### **Members:**

Alan Siegel, Coordinator  
Carol Tomlinson-Keasey, Back-up Coordinator  
Judy D'Amico  
Mark Drummond (absent)  
Herb Fischer  
Carl Guardino (absent)/Dennis Cima (alternate)  
Scott Plotkin (absent)  
Anne Stanton  
Carroll Stevens  
Jack Stewart (absent)

CDE Subcommittee Staff: Mary Donnelly-Ortega

#### **Essential Question for Subcommittee #1:**

How do we make school relevant to students?

#### **Subcommittee's Draft Recommendations:**

1. Expand the number of California Partnership Academies (CPA) that currently exist, expand the CPA model to a four-year program, eliminate the current enrollment requirement of "at-risk" students, provide funding for a CPA liaison, and make the curriculum developed for the CPA available to the public.
  - Expand the number of CPA from the current 289 to 900.
  - Expand the CPA model from the current three-year program for grades ten through twelve to a four-year model for grades nine through twelve.
  - Eliminate the "fifty percent at-risk students" enrollment requirement for a CPA.

- Provide funding for an additional staff position for each CPA. This funded position will be the liaison between the industry partner and the school academy.
  - Curriculum and anchor lessons developed by interdisciplinary academic teams and industry partners will be posted on a statewide data base and made available to the public.
2. Establish business and education partnerships to create “Standards Identification and Demonstration Projects” (Projects) through out the state. This Project will assist teachers in obtaining examples of real-life applications (anchor lessons) for the curriculum they are teaching. Anchor lessons will be obtained from business partners participating in the Project. The Project will have the following components:
- A. Anchor lessons would be:
- Cross-referenced with content standards,
  - Organized by industry sectors,
  - Compiled in a database that is archived on the CDE Web site, and
  - Shared within and between educational systems.
- B. A system to assess the depth of knowledge and practical application of the anchor lessons. This system needs to be developed.
- C. Mathematics should be the first content area to be addressed.

### **Council Member’s Suggestions:**

#### **Recommendation #1**

- See if research supports the idea of including ninth graders in CPA.
- Consider dropping the proposals of eliminating the “fifty percent at-risk students” enrollment requirement and funding for an additional staff position for each CPA.

#### **Recommendation #2**

- Cite the success of previous linkages between business and education.
- Resources may be able to come from a national source rather than state.
- Consider including textbook publishers as a resource in the process.

- Explain how the money allocated to this recommendation would be used.

#### **Subcommittee's Next Steps:**

- Subcommittee #1 will continue working to refine their recommendations.
- Future conference call date: January 18, 2006.

#### **Subcommittee # 2 (Rigor)**

##### **Members:**

Carol Rava Treat, Coordinator  
 Suzanne Tacheny, Coordinator  
 Richard Alonzo (absent)  
 Terry Anderson<sup>1</sup>  
 John Couch (absent)  
 MRC Greenwood (absent)  
 Sherry Lansing  
 Harold Levine (absent)  
 Brian McInnis  
 Stanley Murphy (absent)  
 Curtis Washington

CDE Subcommittee Staff: Jim Miller

#### **Essential Question for Subcommittee #2:**

How can we provide all students the opportunity to master rigorous work-and college-ready curricula?

#### **Subcommittee's Draft Recommendations:**

The following are guiding assumptions for the recommendations made by Subcommittee #2:

1. Rigor presupposes clearly defined expectations that are visible, broadly understood, and consistently applied. Rigor also requires compelling motivation for rising to those expectations.
2. California has multiple indicators of rigor that guide the high school curriculum. Because these different indicators are not well integrated or connected, there is no consistent or widely used standard of rigor. The following is a list of indicators of rigor that California currently uses in high schools:
  - California's academic content standards for student learning, which are widely regarded as among the most rigorous standards in the country.

---

<sup>1</sup> Representative for Senator Don Perata

However, high schools often lack incentives to rise to these standards and not every high school can provide full access to all students.

- California's Standards Test which set performance levels of advanced, proficient, basic, below basic, and far below basic.
  - The A–G course requirements used for entry into the California State University (CSU) system and the University of California (UC). The A–G course requirements play a strong role in shaping high school curricula.
  - Course completion/graduation requirements as defined by state law (in *Education Code* Section 51220), including a requirement that all students must pass Algebra to earn a diploma.
  - California High School Exit Exam, which most would agree is a minimal graduation requirement.
  - Newly adopted standards for Career and Technical Education that focus the rigor of vocational programs.
3. In high school, students develop different interests. Therefore, rigor should not be limited to academic classes but rather should pervade and be evident in all high school courses. The education system should offer many pathways, not different tracks. A career or technical path should not preclude a student from being eligible or prepared for college; nor should a college-preparatory path exclude career or more applied learning courses. Each of these should be equally challenging to ensure that regardless of whether or not students immediately pursue college or the workforce, all are prepared and have multiple options available to them.

#### **Draft Recommendations:**

1. While the standards adopted for California are widely regarded as among the most rigorous in the country, California high schools often do not consistently offer rigorous courses to all students. California must find ways to motivate, engage, and support districts, schools, and teachers to provide challenging courses that prepare all students for higher education and work. Necessary supports might include: making standards aligned materials available, and offering monetary and technical assistance support for districts and schools creating greater access to rigorous college- and work-preparatory courses.
2. California should seek better coordination and connections across the many indicators of rigor in its high school program.
  - California should conduct a systematic, comparative analysis that looks at the intersections of the state's academic and career technical standards, the exit

exam, and local graduation requirements, with the goal being identifying a single, consistent standard of rigor across all of these components.

- The A-G approval process should do more to offer clear criteria for the content of courses that would meet these requirements. Clear criteria, or standards, would help high schools develop more rigorous courses, enable better alignment between kindergarten through grade twelve standards and CSU/UC criteria, and ensure that A-G designations are more consistently applied.

### **Council Member's Suggestions:**

- Teacher training is critical, should be a component in the recommendation.
- Consider being more explicit about embedding content so students do not have to choose between either academic or career and technical education.
- Consider using standards as the definition of rigor. William Daggett's work on rigor may be helpful when looking at content, outcome, and coursework.
- Incorporate the correlation between rigor and relevance in the recommendation.

### **Subcommittee's Next Steps:**

- Subcommittee #2 will continue to discuss their recommendations at the next subcommittee conference call.
- Future conference call dates: January 4, 2006, and January 13, 2006.

### **Subcommittee # 3 (Relationships)**

#### **Members:**

Diane Siri, Coordinator  
Kendall Vaught, Co-Coordinator  
Arlene Ackerman (absent)  
Catherine Atkin  
Marlene Canter (absent)  
Jody Graf (absent)  
Gary Hart  
Bob Hudson  
KimOanh Nguyen-Lam  
Peter Thorp

CDE Subcommittee Staff: Terrie Poulos

### **Essential Question for Subcommittee #3:**

How can we work to ensure that all students develop a sense of community while they are in high school?

### **Subcommittee's Draft Recommendations:**

1. Support the eighth - ninth grade transition plan as recommended by Subcommittee #4, as the subsequent recommendations will be built upon this very important transition.
2. Fund transition plans, beyond the traditional one time eighth - ninth grade transition plans which are designed specifically to build community and ensure the connection by improving the quality of engagements between: Adults/Students; Student/Student; and Student/Community.
  - District plans should reflect local school and community culture and priorities. Small rural communities have different jobs than large urban areas. This must be addressed if we are going to keep students in school.
  - Building community within the school fosters academic success. Students who experience their school as a caring community consistently become more motivated and engaged in their learning.
  - Positive connections between teachers and students, coupled with high expectations, promote academic success.
  - The transition plan will include a plan for exiting from high school to life beyond high school.
3. Fund schools to survey students and parents regarding school services and student connections. From the data, create plans to increase the numbers of disenfranchised students who are currently opting to drop out because they see school as irrelevant to them.
4. Increase multiple pathways, beyond the A-G requirements, to better prepare students for either college or work.

### **Council Member's Suggestions:**

- Research has shown that programs such as Summer Bridge are working, consider including successful programs in your research.
- For the adult to student connection, also consider adults who are not part of the school, but are part of the community.

### **Subcommittee's Next Steps:**

- Subcommittee #3 will discuss their recommendations at the next subcommittee conference call.
- Future conference call date: January 10, 2006.

### **Subcommittee # 4 (Process/Implementation)**

#### **Members:**

Linda Murray, Coordinator  
Shelley Davis, Back-up Coordinator  
Carrie Allen  
Sandy Clifton-Bacon  
Jack Gordon  
Dian Hasson  
Bill Jackson  
Manny Marantal  
Luis Rodriquez (absent)

CDE Subcommittee Staff: Rina DeRose-Swinscoe

#### **Essential Question for Subcommittee #4:**

How can we address critical short-term problem of ninth graders entering high school unprepared to master essential content and skills?

#### **Subcommittee's Draft Recommendations:**

Success in high school can be greatly enhanced by requiring an academic/career plan for all students starting in middle school/junior high school through postsecondary. The plan will identify the college/career tech pathways associated with the individual student's goals and shall be reviewed annually, and modified as needed, as the student progresses through high school.

1. Districts shall provide research-based, state-funded bridge programs for exiting eighth graders who are below or far below basic on the California Standards Tests in ELA and/or mathematics. Participation is mandatory for those students who are far below basic.
2. Grade nine shall be structured as a "transition year program" designed to promote personalization and the ability for teachers to know students well. A dedicated ninth grade counselor will be funded for every 250 students (who are below basic or far below basic) and will be responsible for developing and monitoring interventions for those students.
3. Currently available class size reduction funding shall be enhanced to ensure small classes for core academic areas. Extra resources will be allocated to build



instructional safety nets for students who are not yet proficient on the CST in ELA or Algebra.

4. Provide funding for the AVID programs for middle and high school staff willing to work together to monitor and support students as they transition.

#### **Council Member's Suggestions:**

- Need to establish a menu of model programs for schools, policies, and procedures that can be generalized and disseminated.
- Be cautious about creating more categorical programs (class size reduction, counselors, and bridge programs). Legislatively there could be a concern about mandating funding for isolated programs.
- Target funds for things that are really needed. If funds are unrestricted, they may not get to the right area.
- In the recommendations, invest more resources in transition programs and in ninth grade. The details can be sorted out later. Establish programs based on successful initiatives after an entry-level period.
- Request funding for at least three years to be able to collect data and prove results. Include that the reporting responsibility must be part of the obligation of receiving funds.
- Include school superintendents in the law writing process to determine feasibility of the program requirements. Get input from practitioners when writing the law.

#### **Subcommittee's Next Steps:**

- Subcommittee #4 will consider the comments made by the members of the Council when we draft out next iteration of the recommendation(s).
- Future conference call date: January 18, 2006, and February 15, 2006.

#### **Subcommittee # 5 (Student/Parental Involvement)**

##### **Members:**

Joyce Wright, Coordinator (absent)  
Rhonda Rios-Kravitz, Back-up Coordinator (absent)  
Manny Barbara  
Dorothy Chu  
Jo Loss  
Patty Martel  
Lionel (Skip) Meno (absent)  
Martha Penry (absent)

Marcy Whitebook (absent)

CDE Subcommittee Staff: Rozlynn Worrall

### **Essential Question for Subcommittee #5:**

How can we ensure that all students and parents are deeply aware of stakes (at the back end) and therefore importance of academic choices (at the front end)?

### **Subcommittee's Draft Recommendations:**

Through research, discussion, and subcommittee consensus these guiding principles are at the heart of the recommendations:

- Target audiences are the parents and students with historically low graduation rates and the least success with school and academic achievement (i.e. African Americans/Black, Latino-Chicano/Hispanic, disaggregated sub-groups of Southeast Asian and Pacific Islander populations, American Indian/Native Americans, socio-economically disadvantaged, migrant populations where the primary home language is not English, and in families where literacy levels are low).
- The base campaign to bring awareness and support for parental inclusion and involvement is a consistent statewide approach, contextualized by regional P-16 councils (not determined school by school).
- Products and services would be in parent-friendly, primary language of the home and be delivered attractively through multi-media and interactive formats that engage parents in two-way communications (i.e. radio, TV, magazines, public service advertisements, brochures, pamphlets, newsletters, conferences, parent centers, etc.).
- California's growing population (birth and migration) necessitates a long-term campaign that is ongoing, highly repetitive, future-focused, yet tailored to the immediate concerns of children and their parents at every age, birth through age eighteen.
- The content of the messages would minimally include:
  - High expectations - college and well paying jobs, and the rationale to parents and students for school and education.
  - Demystification of "A-G" parent awareness campaign.
  - Related grade-span academic benchmarks that parents should be aware of and would help guide them in assisting their children in making rigorous academic choices.

- The recommendations need to move beyond the awareness approach to include models, strategies, products, services, and resources for parental empowerment in a collaborative stakeholder environment (training, family services, partnership development with active collaboration between teachers, parents/guardians, students, school administrators, community organizations, businesses, health and social service agencies).

### **Draft Recommendations:**

1. The CDE should develop in conjunction with allied partners (e.g. county offices of education, Regional P-16 Councils, business partners, professional organizations, etc.) a comprehensive, long-term, parent-student-public awareness/involvement campaign promoting and supporting education and high academic expectations for targeted audiences. Target audiences are the parents and students with historically low graduation rates and the least success with school and academic achievement (i.e. African Americans/Black, Latino-Chicano/Hispanic, disaggregated sub-groups of Southeast Asian and Pacific Islander populations, American Indian/Native Americans, socio-economically disadvantaged, migrant populations where the primary home language is not English, and in families where literacy levels are low).

The message content would be focused on that which:

- Promotes and supports education and high academic expectations for target groups from birth through high school (with the goal of attending and graduating from college).
- Promotes and supports a college-going, career-oriented culture for target groups.
- Demystifies and explains to parents and students the rules of the educational process.
- Provides tangible benchmarks for success from early grades through high school, A-G coursework, standards, performance levels, etc.
- Promotes and supports family involvement at home, with the educational institution, and in the broader community (e.g. collaboration across social private, and public institutions).

A. The promotion/awareness component of this recommendation must incorporate the following:

- Consistent statewide, high-interest, multi-media approach, not dependent upon school-to-home (backpack express) communications or the literacy level of the parents (e.g. radio, television, internet, hardcopy such as; brochures, flyers, magazine advertisements, etc.).
  - Wide variety of services and products provided in the primary language for the families of the target groups and tailored for the age, grade-span of the children/students in the family (e.g. services and products for families of elementary students would be different than services and products for families of high school students).
- B. The support component of this recommendation must incorporate aligned products, resources (e.g. models and strategies), services, staffing, and incentives such as:
- Products – parent/student friendly content such as benchmarks planning tools, videos, mailers, brochures, etc.
  - Resources – existing programs, models, practices, strategies, documents, newsletters, links, etc.
  - Services – training and conferences for parents that empower them to influence, assist, and guide their children’s education, parent centers, health services, etc.
  - Staffing – guidance counselors in kindergarten through grade twelve for target groups, designated-parent coordinators, interpreters, etc.
  - Incentives – to families for students’ for academic achievement in rigorous courses and to schools and districts for providing coordinated family involvement programs.
2. The CDE in conjunction with the Office of the Legislative Analyst should conduct a thorough review and analysis of current products, resources, services, staffing, incentives, and funding sources aligned or parallel to the parent/awareness/involvement/ empowerment recommendation above. From the analysis, develop a long-term, cohesive plan for the implementation and funding of the above programs. This may include the development of legislative initiatives, State Board of Education policy, and articulated business and community partnerships.

3. The State Legislature should establish a permanent long-term funding mechanism and infrastructure to support the work of the Statewide and Regional P-16 Councils so that state and regional work are aligned, local context is incorporated, and community partnerships are cohesively fostered.

#### **Council Member's Suggestions:**

- Dissemination of financial aid assistance information may be a good idea to include in recommendations.
- Consider not using A-G terminology; instead make this concept more general.
- Talk about the courses in a more generic fashion.
- Funding for translation of documents into multiple languages should be a component of this recommendation.
- The CDE currently has translated documents on the Web at no cost to schools and districts.
- Do not assume that parents are literate. Needs to be more than one dissemination option (i.e., public broadcasts on radio). School should take responsibility for communication to engage parents.
- Remember that not all parents have access to the system. Some parents who do not speak English pick up information in other places, i.e., beauty salons.

#### **Subcommittee's Next Steps:**

- Comments and suggestions from the Council will be discussed at the scheduled December 14 conference call.
- Future conference call date: December 14, 2005.
- Future meeting date: February 7, 2006

#### **Planning for March 2006 Meeting**

The next meeting will be held at UC Davis on Wednesday, March 1, 2006.

Approved by P-16 Council members on March 1, 2006.